

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 437

September 15, 1995, 1:57 p.m.
Page S-13645 Temp. Record

WELFARE REFORM BILL/State Welfare Entitlement

SUBJECT: Family Self-Sufficiency Act of 1995 . . . H.R. 4. Dole motion to strike the Bradley amendment No. 2496 (as previously agreed to) to the Dole modified perfecting amendment No. 2280 to the committee substitute amendment.

ACTION: MOTION AGREED TO, 50-44

SYNOPSIS: As reported with a committee substitute amendment, H.R. 4, the Family Self-Sufficiency Act of 1995, will overhaul 6 of the Nation's 10 largest welfare programs.

The Dole modified perfecting amendment would strike the provisions of the committee substitute amendment and insert in lieu thereof substitute provisions, entitled "The Work Opportunity Act of 1995."

The Bradley amendment, as agreed to by voice vote, would require States to state in explicit detail how they planned to reform welfare before they would be eligible for family assistance grants, and they would then be required to provide benefits as an entitlement, without regard to the availability of funds, to anyone who qualified for benefits under their plans. (The Dole amendment would create family assistance block grants as a replacement for the current Aid to Families with Dependent Children welfare program). The amendment's requirements for State plans would include that they would have to specify need and benefit standards based upon family size and income, that eligibility and ineligibility rules would have to be set forth, and that no one eligible for assistance could be put on a waiting list to receive such assistance.

The Dole motion to strike would eliminate the text of the Bradley amendment, as earlier agreed to.

NOTE: The Dole motion was in order by unanimous consent.

Those favoring the motion to strike contended:

We apologize to our colleague from New Jersey. When we agreed to accept his amendment yesterday we misunderstood it. Upon further examination, we have found that we have three very serious objections to it. First, the amendment's requirement for State

(See other side)

YEAS (50)			NAYS (44)			NOT VOTING (6)	
Republicans (48 or 98%)		Democrats (2 or 4%)	Republicans (1 or 2%)	Democrats (43 or 96%)		Republicans (5)	Democrats (1)
Abraham	Helms	Exon	Jeffords	Akaka	Johnston	Bond ⁻²	Boxer ⁻²
Ashcroft	Hutchison	Heflin		Baucus	Kennedy	Chafee ⁻²	
Bennett	Inhofe			Biden	Kerrey	Nickles ⁻²	
Brown	Kassebaum			Bingaman	Kerry	Stevens ⁻²	
Burns	Kempthorne			Bradley	Kohl	Thomas ^{-2AY}	
Campbell	Kyl			Breaux	Lautenberg		
Coats	Lott			Bryan	Leahy		
Cochran	Lugar			Bumpers	Levin		
Cohen	Mack			Byrd	Lieberman		
Coverdell	McCain			Conrad	Mikulski		
Craig	McConnell			Daschle	Moseley-Braun		
D'Amato	Murkowski			Dodd	Moynihan		
DeWine	Packwood			Dorgan	Murray		
Dole	Pressler			Feingold	Nunn		
Domenici	Roth			Feinstein	Pell		
Faircloth	Santorum			Ford	Pryor		
Frist	Shelby			Glenn	Reid		
Gorton	Simpson			Graham	Robb		
Gramm	Smith			Harkin	Rockefeller		
Grams	Snowe			Hollings	Sarbanes		
Grassley	Specter			Inouye	Simon		
Gregg	Thompson				Wellstone		
Hatch	Thurmond						
Hatfield	Warner						

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

definitions on eligibility and on ineligibility would open States up to lawsuits over those definitions. Second, the requirement that States provide benefits to anyone deemed eligible is an entitlement requirement. The solution to reforming welfare is not to make it a State entitlement program instead of a Federal entitlement program. Third, and relatedly, this entitlement would be an unfunded mandate--if not enough Federal funds were available, a State would have to use its own funds. This amendment should never have been adopted. We therefore urge our colleagues to join us in striking it from the bill.

Those opposing the motion to strike contended:

We were rather surprised when our colleagues agreed to accept this amendment yesterday. At the same time we were pleased, though, because it does have merit. The Bradley amendment would basically require States to set clear rules for their welfare reform programs and to stick by them. It would not create a Federal entitlement nor would it increase Federal spending. Further, it would not entitle anyone to anything. Individuals would only get benefits to the extent that a State designed a program entitling them to those benefits. States could not treat eligible individuals differently, but they would not have to make anyone eligible in the first place. Therefore, we think it is a mistake to describe this amendment as an entitlement or as an unfunded mandate. All the amendment would demand is that States treat eligible individuals equally. It is a fair demand, so we oppose the motion to strike.